REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 25, 2004. Claims 24, 27, 29, 58, 59, 62, and 63 are presented for examination, of which Claims 24, 27, 62, and 63, the independent claims, have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 24, 27, 29, 58, 59, 62, and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for lack of adequate written description.

Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicants have deleted from Claims 24, 27, 62, and 63 have been amended to delete the feature that the second copying mode is performed in response to a copying designation by a user. It is believed that the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,021, 892 (*Kita et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,989,163 (*Kawamata et al.*). Claims 24, 59, 62, and 63 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kita et al.* in view of *Kawamata et al.*, as well as being unpatentable over *Kita et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,113,494 (*Menendez et al.*). Claim 26 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kita et al.* in view of *Kawamata et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,218,458 (*Kochis et al.*), as well as being unpatentable over *Kita et al.* and *Menendez et al.*, and further in view of *Kochis et al.* Claim 29 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kita et al.* in view of *Kawamata et al.*, and further in view of *Kochis et al.* Claim 58 was rejected under Section 103(a) as

9

being patentable over *Kita et al.* in view of *Kawamata et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,900,947 (*Kenmochi*), as well as being unpatentable over *Kita et al.* in view of *Menendez et al.*, and further in view of *Kenmochi*.

As shown above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 24, 27, 62, and 63 in terms that more clearly define what they regard as their invention. Applicants submit that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 24 is an image processing device that includes a scanner, a control unit, a first bidirectional general-purpose interface, and a second bidirectional general-purpose interface. The scanner reads an image of a document and outputs an image signal. The control unit, including a control circuit, is adapted for controlling the image processing device and for performing image processing on the image signal output from the scanner to provide a first processed image signal. The image processing is processing that is necessary for copying. The first bidirectional general-purpose interface transmits, under control of the control unit, the image signal output by the scanner to an external computer, which performs image processing on the transmitted image signal to provide a second processed image signal. The image processing is processing that is necessary for copying. This interface is also for receiving the second processed image signal from the external computer. The second bidirectional general-purpose interface conforms to the same standard as the first bidirectional general-purpose interface, and is adapted for outputting the first processed image signal and the second processed image signal to a printer.

10

The image processing device of Claim 24 has a plurality of modes, including a read mode, a print mode, a first copying mode, performed in response to a copying designation by a user, and a second copying mode in which the image signal output from the scanner is outputted to the printer without being processed the external computer. In the first copying mode, the image signal from the scanner is transmitted in order of the control unit, the first bidirectional general-purpose interface, the external computer, the first bidirectional interface, the control unit, and the second bidirectional general-purpose interface so as to perform copying based on the second processed image signal. In the second copying mode, the image signal from the scanner is transmitted in order of the control unit and the second bidirectional general-purpose interface so as to perform copying based on the first processed image signal. The image processing performed by the external computer in the first copying mode is different from the image processing in the second copying mode.

Among other notable features of Claim 24 is that the image processing performed by the external computer in the first copying mode is different from the image processing in the second copying mode. Support for this feature may be found at least at page 30, lines 16-18, of the specification.[1]

The applied art, alone or in combination, is not seen to disclose or suggest the aspects of the present invention defined by independent Claim 24, particularly with respect to that the image processing performed by the external computer in the first copying mode is different from the image processing in the second copying mode.

---

[1]/It is to be understood, of course, that the claim scope is not limited by the details of the described embodiments, which are referred to only to facilitate explanation.

11

As discussed previously, *Kita et al.* relates to a machine that has a read mode, which corresponds to the IMAGE INPUT function (column 6, line 68) and reading image data by the image scanner 2 and transferring the data to the host 8 (column 18, line 24 to column 20, line 12). Applicants further understand the *Kita et al.* device as having a print mode which corresponds to the IMAGE PRINT function (column 7, line 5) and recording image data generated in the host 8 by the image printer 3 (column 20, line 12 to column 21, line 45). Further, *Kita et al.* has a second copying mode, corresponding to the COPY function of *Kita et al.* (column 6, line 50).

The Office Action cites the IMAGE INPUT function and column 5, lines 65-68 of *Kita et al.*, as corresponding to the first copying mode of Claim 24. Applicants respectfully disagree. Column 5, lines 65-68, of *Kita et al.* merely provides a list of timings/events (specifically four different events) when the image data codec control portion 69 is operated. However, no relationship between the operations of these events is stated or suggested. *Kita et al.* is silent about operations (1) to (3) being performed consecutively in response to a copy designation by a user. Assuming that operations (1) to (4) (device 1 is in a facsimile status, image data ready by the image scanner 2 is compressed and then transferred to the personal computer 8, compression data sent from the personal computer 8 is recorded by the image printer 3, and binary image data outputted form the personal computer 8 is transmitted via facsimile) are performed consecutively, Applicants fail to reason why operation (4) (binary image data outputted form the personal computer 8 is transmitted via facsimile) is performed in response to the copying designation.

12

Further, Applicants understand the IMAGE INPUT function of *Kita et al.*
(column 6, line 68, to column 7, line 4) as transmitting image data read by the scanner 2 to
the personal computer 8, which displays the image data on the CRT display and/or files the
image data in a floppy disk. The IMAGE INPUT function, however, lacks the processing
of the first copying mode of Claim 24, in which an image signal is output by a scanner to
an external computer which performs image processing on the transmitted image signal to
provide a second processed image signal, where the image processing is necessary for a
copying operation.

The Examiner asserts, in the Response to Arguments section of the Office
Action, that *Kita et al.* discloses the processing of the first copying mode. The Examiner
cites *Kita et al.* as disclosing transmitting scanned image data from the scanner to the host
(column 7, lines 1-4), where image and data processing are carried out by the computer
(column 3, lines 46-48), and that the data may be stored on a disk and then transmitted to
the printer (column 20, lines 6-67). The Examiner asserts that the combination of these
three passages discloses the processing of the first copying mode. Applicants respectfully
disagree. Applicants understand column 3, lines 46-48, of *Kita et al.* as merely discussing
that "[v]arious image and data processing are carried out by the computer 8 according to
the programs for respective applications." That is, this cited passage discusses in a very
general manner that data processing is carried out by the computer 8. However, the cited
passage is silent with regard to the external computer performing image processing on the
transmitted image signal <u>to provide a second processed image signal,</u> where the image
processing is necessary for a copying operation, as recited in Claim 24. Applicants
respectfully request the Examiner specifically identify those portions of *Kita et al.* that

13

teaches or suggests the external computer performing image processing on the transmitted image signal to provide a second processed image signal, where the image processing is necessary for a copying operation, as recited in Claim 24.

Still further, column 6, line 65, to column 7, line 7 of *Kita et al.* discusses the IMAGE INPUT function and the IMAGE PRINT function, which the Examiner has equated to the first copying mode of Claim 24; the COPY function of *Kita et al.* corresponding to the second copying mode of the Claim 24. However, nothing has been found in *Kita et al.* that would teach or suggest the image processing performed by the external computer in the first copying mode is different from the image processing in the second copying mode. Applicants reiterate that there is no correlation of the passage at column 3, lines 46-48, with the IMAGE INPUT function at column 6, line 68, to column 7, line 4.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 24 is clearly patentable over *Kita et al.*, taken alone.

Kawamata et al., *Menendez et al.*, *Kochis et al.*, and *Kenmochi* are not believed to add anything that would overcome the deficiencies of *Kita et al.* as a reference against Claim 24.

Accordingly, Claim 24 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Kita et al.*, *Kawamata et al.*, and *Menendez et al.*, taken separately or in any proper combination (if any).

Independent Claims 27, 62, and 63 include a feature similar to that discussed above in connection with Claim 24. Accordingly, Claims 27, 62, and 63 are

14

believed to be patentable for substantially the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 24.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

15

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

_____
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

16